Special Double Issue

Can U. S. Capitalism Prosper in Peaceful Co-Existence? See Weir's Answer, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. II, NUMBERS 47-48 JANUARY 10, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Fateful Decision Nobody Talks About

Of the events of the holiday fortnight, none was more important and none received less attention than the 2-to-1 decision by the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington upholding the McCarran Internal Security Act and the registration order issued under it against the Communist Party. This system of registration orders, if allowed to stand by the Supreme Court, promises to become our equivalent of the yellow Star of David the Nazis pinned upon the Jews. Not indeed that ours are racist symbols, or need to be worn upon the lapel. But under this system every radical, liberal or other non-conformist will speak at the risk of being called on to explain why he is not registered as a Communist on penalty of five years in jail. The agonies of the loyalty probe, again being exposed in all their painful folly by the Ladejinsky case, will be extended outside the government service. The effect, as President Truman warned in his unsuccessful effort to block this legislation by veto, will be to make it prudent "to avoid saying anything that might be construed as not deviating sufficiently from the current Communist propaganda line."

Fear is already evident in the current attitude of the newspapers which four years ago applauded Mr. Truman for that veto message. Only one of them, the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, (Dec. 27) protested the Circuit Court decision validating the Act they had all opposed. Three leading newspapers, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* reversed themselves and welcomed the ruling. The rest were silent. The role of those suddenly struck dumb is a depressing one. The *Wall Street Journal*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Post*, the Chicago *Sun-Times*, the Madison, Wis., *Capital-Times*, the Milwaukee *Journal*, the Des Moines, Iowa, *Register*, the Chicago *Daily News*, though fresh from campaigning against McCarthyism and exercised over the Ladejinsky case, had said not one word editorially up to the time we went to press. Even the York, Pa., *Gazette and Daily*, the bright candle in the naughty world of American journalism, the one daily which supported Wallace in 1948, failed to comment. The liberal columnists, Max Lerner, Marquis Childs, Tom Stokes, Doris Fleeson, Murray Kempton, kept their eyes discreetly averted.

Forgetfulness or Fear?

The silence is the more shocking because all these papers and writers spoke out in alarm last August when Senators Humphrey, Morse and Douglas, to prove that they themselves were irreproachably homogenized, fathered an amendment to the McCarran Act setting up standards to determine who is a Communist. These are so broad that the three Senators could easily be proscribed under them. They are the standards which would now determine who must register.

These editors and writers have not so soon forgotten. They falter because this first registration order is against the Communist party, and one just does not defend Communists any more. The liberal newspapers gravitate toward mistaken identity cases, and look for *reductio ad absurdums*. A Ladejinsky case is easy grist for the editorial mill. A government official who has been praised by MacArthur, cleared by Scott McLeod and smeared by anti-Semites may be defended against charges of Communism without too much danger.

It would be a happy event for timorous editors if the Subversive Activities Control Board would rally all the better elements of the country against it by issuing its first registration order against—let us say—the board of directors of the Chase National Bank. Unfortunately that is not how the foundations of freedom are first rendered shaky. The principle that the government has a right to make you account for your political views is more easily established by starting with some untouchable extremist fringe the respectables shudder to defend. In this case, until the Communist party has been ordered to register, it is impossible to proceed against individuals for non-registration as Communists. The registration order against the Communist party is the keystone of the whole McCarran Act structure. Once that order has been upheld, the damage is done. Then will come the turn of the Ladejinskys. Not all will be condemned. Some will be acquitted. But even those who win their clearance will have been put to so much pain, trouble and bad publicity as to put all others on notice that the only safety lies in conformity. An Orwellized America will have arrived.

Just a Circuit Court Decision?

Some will say that this is *merely* the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals. There could be no more foolish way to salve conscience. The Circuit Court is the only court of appeals in which a man has a *right* to be heard in Federal cases. Whether he gets a hearing in the Supreme Court depends in almost all cases on privilege, not right. It seems unthinkable, but it is not certain that the Supreme Court will consent to review this decision, much less that it will consent to review all the vital issues involved in it. It takes the vote of four Justices in chambers to win a hearing, and if the country so takes this order for granted, if there is so little protest, the Court too will be affected. It is often dominated by what it thinks *politic*. In this atmosphere, the Court might also decide it would be better to put the issue on the shelf for settlement later, and leave the Circuit Court decision stand.

(Continued on Page Eight)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nobody Seems to Realize the Die Is Cast for Atomic War

In a front page article, ***"The Fatal Decisions Have Already Been Made,"*** (Nov. 1) we were the first publication in this country to call attention to the implications of a little noticed speech by Marshal Montgomery in London on planning for World War III. Montgomery indicated that NATO planning was based on the use of atomic weapons for defense *whether the enemy attack was atomic or not.* Despite protest in the House of Commons, this was endorsed at last month's meeting of the NATO Council in Paris.

The phrasing was deliberately obscure and few publications in this country had any interest in deciphering the meaning clearly for the American public. The NATO decision fell into two parts. The first was that the military were authorized to plan for an atomic war. The second was that the Governments would retain the responsibility for putting these plans into effect. The latter is eye-wash meant to hide two things from our own people and from our allies.

It Will Be Too Late

It is eye-wash, first of all, because if operational plans are made and military forces recast to use the various kinds of atomic weapons now available, there will be little real margin of decision left. It will be difficult in practice to make an atomic army fight a conventional war; the war might be lost in the confusion of the change-over; there would be no time.

It is eye-wash, in the second place, because it is intended to convey the idea to Western Europe that the question of atomic war will be in the hands of the governments making up the NATO Council. Actually each government will be free to make up its own mind. In practice that means the U.S. will decide. All our eggs are in the basket of our highly publicized Strategic Air Command, which is not subject to NATO and which is geared to massive atomic reprisal. The SAC by bombing Russia would open Western Europe to atomic counter-attack.

This is what Western Europe wants to avoid. The reason why is set forth by the famous military expert, B. H. Liddell Hart, in a long letter published last Monday (Jan. 3) in the London *Times*. Hart says that as few as five and certainly as many as ten thermonuclear devices could wipe out all England's main centers of population and that "still fewer would paralyze the vital centers of France, Belgium and Holland." He says these can now be delivered, without possibility of interception by rockets from Russian bases in Germany.

"The value of armies," Hart wrote, "lies in providing a non-suicidal defense against attack. To arm them with atomic weapons is to destroy the case for maintaining them. In that form they would increase the risks of spreading a local conflict into a universal conflagration without diminishing the fatal prospect."

Montgomery and others have sold the idea that the West must use atomic weapons to provide time to mobilize reserves. The London *Observer* correspondent at the NATO Council meeting in Paris reported (Dec. 19) "psychiatrists who have been consulted on the human effects of the types of destruction and chaos which the military would expect have said that after four days of this experience [atomic war] the formation of new units would probably be impossible."

If war comes, it will be atomic. Whichever side feels it is in danger of losing, will loose the nightmare on mankind whatever happens at the beginning of the conflict.

The only way out is to fight against war altogether, and to begin to cut down tension by ending further nuclear weapon experiments. In this connection earlier warnings are reinforced from an unexpected quarter.

Even the Hearst Press Alarmed

The day after Christmas the New York *Journal-American* ran a long dispatch on its editorial page from its chief European correspondent, Kingsbury Smith, "A-H Bomb Tests Threaten Mankind." Smith quoted a high-ranking NATO officer in close touch with nuclear developments as saying "he fully shared the view that a serious danger could confront mankind 20 years hence if the experimental explosions were not curtailed and strictly limited."

The Democrats in Congress are getting ready to investigate the cuts in the Army projected by the Eisenhower Administration. Their motives are mixed. Smarting from charges of "treason," they are always on the lookout for a chance to appear more patriotic than the Republicans. They have always favored higher military expenditures. They would perform a public service if instead of merely playing Army politics, they threw this whole subject wide open. The public knows entirely too little of the real facts.

Morning-After Blues on German-Jap Rearmament

IN WASHINGTON: Though little evident in public statements, behind the scenes there is considerable cooling off of fervor in Washington about German and Japanese rearmament . . . Some officials are even talking privately of the former as a "frank gamble" . . . One reason for lessened fervor is that both German and Japanese interests are trying to drive a hard bargain . . . Neither wants to divert energy from civilian output and exports to military production . . . American grants and loans are being asked to finance expansion of German and Japanese industry to the point where rearmament can be piled on top of "business as usual." . . . Their mood is much like that of our business men in 1940 . . .

IN BONN: Not Reported in the American Press: The semi-official Allensbach Institute at Bonn on New Year's Day published the results of a West German public opinion poll which showed: less than half the Germans favor rearmament and nearly 40 percent are violently opposed to it. What Germans are most concerned with now are unification and the recovery of the Saar, Silesia and East Prussia but an overwhelming majority is against going to war for this purpose. Perhaps one reason is that most Germans polled expressed the view that in a new war the Western Powers would withdraw, leaving Germany to be destroyed by atom bombs. Two-thirds of all Germans believe the Saar should be returned to the Reich.

IN PARIS: For the Scrap-Book: Harold Callender, the *New York Times* correspondent in Paris, reported of the debate on German rearmament: "Nobody spoke in favor of German rearmament. Everybody regretted it . . ." (NYT, 2/1/55, Review of the News, P. 3) and on the vote, "the 98 Communist and fellow-travelling deputies, for once, did not distort the result. Their opposition to German rearmament, while it jibed with Moscow's policies, also jibed not only with the views of the approximately one-fifth of the French voters who had elected them but with the views of something not far from five-fifths of the French voters as a whole." (NYT, 2/1/55, P. 5.) The atmosphere in Paris must be pretty overwhelming to make the rather conventional Mr. Callender write in such strong terms.

IN TOKYO: Not Reported in the American Press. One reason for concern about Japanese rearmament is the reappearance of the "patriotic assassins" who terrorized pre-war moderates. Four of those who murdered pre-war Premiers have been released from prison and delivered inflammatory speeches recently at public meetings. One was the man who assassinated Prime Minister Hamaguchi in 1930 and the other the assassin of Finance Minister Inoye in 1932. Richard Hughes, Tokyo correspondent of the *Sunday Times* of London, reported December 19 that similar threats of assassination led to Yoshida's recent resignation and that his successor, Hatoyama, "has ventured no denunciation of pre-war terrorist methods which, if not stamped out, may recur to plague him in his turn."

Watch Next Week's Issue for A Full Report on the Opening of the New Congress and the Eisenhower Program

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Weir Shows Normal Peacetime Growth Will Require Enormous Industrial Expansion

A Big Business Man Renews His Plea for Co-Existence

By Ernest T. Weir

Never in all history has humanity had so great an opportunity to exercise a choice as to what its future shall be. And never before has it been confronted with a choice between such drastic extremes. Scientific knowledge and the ability to apply that knowledge in practical ways have been increasing at an ever-faster rate—particularly over the past half century. It is difficult for the mind to grasp the enormous development that has taken place before our eyes. And the prospect for future development defies the imagination.

A Livable World or Suicide

The critical question is will humanity use this expanding knowledge, and the ability to apply it, as a tool or a weapon? Will these things result in a better, more livable world, or in the suicide of civilization? I am convinced that the answer to this question is being formulated by those of us who live today—and that no individual can escape a personal responsibility for his contribution to that answer.

As some of you may know, I have been deeply interested in this question for some years. I have devoted a great deal of time and study to it—as part of which I have made a trip to Europe each year since the end of the war. I have written and spoken about it extensively. Frankly, during part of this time I have been discouraged. At times, the movement of world affairs seemed to be in the wrong direction—on the way to world disaster. I am happy that I can say tonight that I believe a change has taken place. In my opinion, the outlook is now more hopeful and promising than it has been. And the reasons for this view stem from the economic and political situations that I think are developing in the world today.

Now, in referring to the economic situation, I am speaking about the long term rather than the short term. I do not mean to imply that the short term is unimportant. As businessmen, the short term is something that you and I must always be concerned about. In fact, it is a universal concern—as is demonstrated, for instance by the amount of newspaper space devoted to various aspects of it during the past year. It is rather generally agreed that 1954 has been a year of recession. Actually, by peacetime standards, it has been one of the better years. In its transition from conditions created by the Korean War, it probably represents the most remarkable adjustment to a peace economy that our country has ever seen.

Nevertheless, production *has* been down from previous levels and there is some unemployment. And even if unemployment should be as low as 1%, it is little consolation to the fellow who is out of a job to know that 99 others are working. It is also not particularly consoling to the businessman whose industry is down at the moment for some reason to know that other parts of the economy are thriving. In the steel industry we did not particularly relish operations below 60%. Nevertheless, ups and downs have been constant in the affairs of men since the dawn of history and no perfect insulation against their effects has yet been devised. At present we are again on the upgrade and I believe that in 1955 we can look forward to a year somewhat better than 1954.

The Real Worry

In terms of its effect on the world problem, however, it is the long-term economic situation that is important. In this connection, let me say that our real worry will not be temporary periods of recession and unemployment—although of course everything possible must be done to minimize their effects. The real worry will be to find the ways and means to provide for constantly growing needs and demands of the world's peoples.

Let me illustrate by reference to my own industry. Present steelmaking capacity is about 125 million tons per year. United States population is about 160 million. It is estimated by the year 2000—only 45 years away—United States population will be 300 million. To provide for the same per capita consumption of steel as in 1953, the steel industry, by the year 2000, will need at the least—an additional 85 million tons of steelmaking capacity. This means that between now and then—on this basis—the steel industry will have to add an average of almost two million tons of ingot capacity per year. This would be the equivalent to creating—from iron ore and coal mines right on through all the finishing processes—an entirely new steel company every four years bigger than National Steel, the country's fifth largest.

Editor's Note

Because of its humanity and its hopefulness, because of the light it throws on the better currents molding Eisenhower Administration policy, and because we believe it deserves as wide an audience as possible for the New Year, we are reprinting here the speech, "Which Future: War or Peace?" made a few weeks ago before the Cleveland, Ohio, Engineering Society by Ernest T. Weir, chairman of National Steel Corporation, a frequent visitor to the White House and a close business associate of Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. In July, 1953, the *Weekly* was the first national publication to reprint one of the pamphlets Mr. Weir had begun to issue in his one-man campaign for peaceful co-existence. This speech is his latest report after his most recent trip abroad. We are mailing each of our subscribers an extra copy so that they may pass it on to friends.

Steel Consumption Will Increase

This is on the basis of a stationary per capita consumption of steel. It has never remained stationary. There is no reason to think it ever will. In 1900 consumption was 300 pounds per person per year. In 1920 it was less than 900 pounds. In 1940 about 1000 pounds. In 1950 less than 1300 pounds. In 1953 about 1400 pounds. This gives you an idea of the progression. No one knows what increase will take place in per capita consumption. If I knew, it probably would scare me. But it is plain that the real job the steel industry faces over the next 45 years is adding the equivalent of a bigger steel company than National Steel on an average of something *less* than every four years.

To put it another way, the expansion that will be required of the steel industry over the next 45 years will be the approximate equal of building from the ground up all of the present facilities of the industry's six largest companies—United States Steel, Bethlehem, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, National Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube. Bear in mind that these are *companies* which together operate a great many plants at different locations. As engineers you can readily appreciate what such expansion will mean in capital expenditure and employment on construction and subsequent employment in production.

World Living Standards Rising

Steel is basic. What applies to steel will apply to other lines of production. The entire economy faces the need for a very great expansion just to maintain *present* standards of living. Naturally, these standards will not stand still. They will continue to improve and possibly at an even faster rate than in the past. In the United States this progress is the norm. It is expected. But that has not been true in other parts of the world. Peoples of other countries have wanted more, have wanted to live better—but, as a rule, have con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Victor in A New War Would Preside Over A Heap of Cinders . . .

sidered improving standards as beyond practical reach and have been more or less resigned to their fate.

Now there is a definite change in attitude and it holds utmost significance for the long-term economic situation of the world as a whole. I recently returned from a visit to Europe. While I was in Paris, there was an automobile show. It was held in a very large exhibition hall near the Place de la Concorde. There was an admission charge, yet that hall was crowded—jammed with people from morning to night. The show lasted 10 days and more than one million persons paid the price of admission to see those automobiles. I went twice but turned away each time when I saw the crowds at the doors. A friend advised me to wait for a special day when the admission charge was doubled. He thought this would cut down the attendance. I took his advice but found that the crowd was every bit as large.

They Want to Own Automoblies

The important thing is that it was not mere curiosity that brought out that throng of people. They came because they want to own automobiles and now think they see better prospects of doing so. And that is something new in Europe. In the same vein, there is another new development. You know that in Europe there has never been extensive installment buying as in the United States. Now the Renault Company is making an approach to it in France. Here is the way it works. A Frenchman goes to a Renault show room, picks out his car, and signs papers in which he agrees to pay one-third of the sales price over a period of nine months. At the end of that period he is allowed to take delivery of the car and then has 27 months in which to pay off the balance.

These things, and others, indicate that the mass domestic market is really beginning to develop in Western Europe. It is coming in response to an active and insistent public demand for better living. We know from our American experience what this will mean. It will have profound effects on the European economy and, in my opinion, the results will be good for Europe—and the world. There are no really remote areas anywhere. People everywhere today know that there are better ways of life than the ones they have. They want to improve themselves and are determined to do it. Rather than something to be feared, this determination can be a tremendous constructive force . . . leading to economic activity, trade and general prosperity on the world level far beyond anything known in the past.

There is a distinct improvement between Western Europe as it is today and as it was on my last visit a year ago. Now there is a hustle and bustle everywhere. There is practically no unemployment in France. There is also considerable building. There are many other signs of stepped up activity. In England, the difference is even more impressive. I made my first trip to London 48 years ago and have been there many times since. I can say truly that never has that great city looked better than it does today. There is a scarcity of labor in England. The steel industry is operating 100% and falling steadily behind on deliveries. This year 300,000 housing units are being built and on a comparative basis that equals present construction in the United States. New production records also are being established in autos, textiles, feed, clothing and other lines.

Evidence of a New Prosperity

There is every outward evidence of a new prosperity and it is not confined to England and France but is general in Western Europe. And it is all the more remarkable because this has occurred while there was a down trend in the United States. Many people believed that any recession here would cause a full-blown depression overseas. You know the old saying that when the United States gets a cold, Europe gets pneumonia. It has not happened . . . quite the reverse.

Along with this economic activity there is something else of probably greater importance. That is the change in the spirit and attitude of the people. On earlier visits Europeans were plainly a beaten people. They were still dazed and devitalized by their war experiences. They did not know where to begin the attack on their immediate problems . . . and as to the future, they seemed to despair of ever being able to find a sound footing again. Now it is apparent to any visitor—and many recent visitors have commented on this—that Western Europe has turned a corner. There is hope and confidence. You are impressed by a general feeling among the people that they are on the way up. There is a sense of direction, a belief that at last firm foundations are being built for sound home economies and that the nations of Europe are moving again to their former positions of importance in world affairs.

Changes in Western Europe

Now does this imply that Western Europe has come to the place where it can stand on its own feet . . . that it will be less dependent on the United States for financial aid . . . and also that it will be more independent in world political action?

I believe that all of these things are definitely true. In my opinion, the time is now at hand when we can and should substantially reduce our aid to the countries of Western Europe and look toward its complete elimination. And this will be good for both Europe and the United States.

On the political side, Western Europe now asserts and will continue to assert the right to a much stronger voice in international affairs. Since the war, the relationship of the United States to Europe has been, in the main, that of leader to follower. Europe will now insist not only on a more equal status but also on recognition of the right to a European viewpoint that may differ from the United States viewpoint. And, in my opinion, this also will be good both for Europe and the United States. In fact, it is the development of this situation that caused me to say at the outset that the world outlook is now so much more hopeful and promising.

Two Real Centers of Power

Since the war, the two real centers of power in the world have been the United States and Russia. And these two centers have conducted themselves as armed camps, each viewing the other with suspicion and hostility. I hold no brief for Russia. But I believe we must admit that until recently the policy of the United States—and the great bulk of opinion expressed by certain military men, by certain members of Congress, and in a number of news organs—created the impression of a nation convinced that world problems could not be solved short of forcible means.

There has been little belief in Europe that either the United States or Russia wanted war. But for a time there was a definite and widespread fear that the attitudes of these two countries could easily precipitate a war. Europe not only *disbelieves* that war between the Communist and free worlds is an *inevitable necessity* . . . Europe definitely *believes* that the way can be found for the two worlds to occupy the same planet in peace.

In contrast with the United States, you hear very little talk about war in Europe. In fact, if you want to discuss the subject you have to bring it up yourself. In Europe, they are convinced that the danger of war has become more remote. It is obvious also that they are determined to have peace. Their whole emphasis is on rebuilding, on economic development, on better conditions of life and on a state of world affairs which will make all these things possible.

Western Europe—A Third Force

Western Europe is now developing—we can even say *has now developed*—as a third force in the world with these objectives as its basic policy. While it was in a weakened condition, it could do little about that policy. With its newly-gained greater strength, confidence and firmness of purpose, it can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Fresh Approach Needed: A Hostile Co-Existence Would Only Lead to War

. . . and I predict it will. In fact, I believe it is because of the new atmosphere in Europe that we have seen the peaceful solution of some very thorny problems. Examples are the Trieste, the Suez Canal, and the Iranian oil disputes—any one of which could have sparked very serious trouble.

It is because of this new atmosphere that the London Conference succeeded after hope for the unity of Western Europe seemed entirely gone with rejection by France of the Defense Community proposal. It is notable that, although the United States was a participant, the London Agreement was dominantly of and by Europeans. The diplomatic leadership came from England and the real foundation of the agreement is French confidence that, under this Plan, German military strength will be controlled . . . plus, of course, French self-confidence arising from the fact that, under the leadership of Mendes-France, there appears to be a firm government in France for the first time since the war.

It is notable also that despite Russia's open opposition to the London Agreement, the countries of Europe are calmly proceeding with preparations for its ratification. To me this is a most effective refutation of the statement frequently made in the United States that the sum and substance of European policy is appeasement of Russia.

Make no mistake about it. There is nothing of appeasement in Europe's position. The people there are every bit as firmly dedicated to the principles of individual freedom . . . and every bit as strongly determined to preserve the free way of life . . . as the loudest and most frantic champions of the "get tough" policy in the United States. It is just that they think there is a better way to do it than to blow Russia and China off the map . . . and ourselves in the process.

The People Demand Peace

The objective of the countries of Western Europe—every country—is peace, not war. It is the objective because that is what the great mass of people in every country demand . . . and, in my opinion, are determined to have. Europe believes peace is possible and it is convinced that the people of Communist countries are just as strongly opposed to war as the people in the Western World. And because of that, Western Europe believes that a way can be worked out to live with Russia and China on a basis of peace. Now there, of course, is where the rub comes in. This is where Europe differs so sharply from those who argue for a "tough" policy in the United States. But this is what Europe believes and this is the line that Europe is going to follow.

I place this emphasis on Western European policy for two reasons. First, in and of itself, it is something that the United States must take into account. Second, it raises the question of whether a similar policy is not also the right one for the United States. For my part, I definitely believe it is. Let us take a look at some of the reasons for this belief.

No Nation Dares to Have War

The first reason . . . the reason of fundamental importance is that today *no* nation dares to have a war. President Eisenhower indicated what the consequences would be in his proposal for peaceful development of atomic power and on other occasions. People who have inside knowledge of the new weapons have spoken plainly about their terrible potential for destruction.

An example is Thomas E. Murray, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, who by virtue of his position is thoroughly familiar with all the facts. He recently said this:

"I consider it . . . the sober truth to say that atomic energy has resulted in the greatest change in man's relations with nature since the fateful day in the Garden of Eden . . . Man has within his grasp an unlimited force, the very source of all energy in nature, atomic energy . . . The difficulty is that this force is a potential equally for death as for life . . . *The misuse of atomic energy means death on a scale that staggers the imagination.*"

Now this is known fully in every nation . . . by leaders and people. Russia, for instance, has gone to quite some length to educate its people to the meaning of the H-Bomb and has emphasized that *no* nation can escape destruction. And that, of course, is a fact that is generally accepted. After a nuclear war, the so-called victor would find himself presiding over a world that had been reduced to a heap of cinders.

Nevertheless, so long as the world's most powerful nations deal with each other on a continuing basis of distrust and hostility, there is always the danger that there will be an incident or a small war that will grow into the Big War. I firmly believe that if the Big War comes, at some point one side or the other will drop the Bomb. Then the fat will be in the fire.

Live Together or Die Together

As Bertrand Russell put it recently, the only real choice that the people of the world have today is that choice: To *live* together or to *die* together. The fact is that war has moved to such extreme levels of destructive power that it has lost whatever excuse it *ever* had as an instrument of international policy. Every nation knows this. I believe it would have a most salutory effect if the principal nations acknowledged it.

After the terms of the London Agreement are put into effect, as I am convinced they will be . . . and after Russia accepts this as an accomplished fact, as I believe she will . . . I would like to see the United States, England, France and Russia meet together and subscribe to a declaration formally pledging the renunciation of war as an instrument of policy.

These are the nations which have the technical knowledge, means and skill to produce and use atomic weapons. Each of them knows that against these weapons there is no defense . . . that the result of their use will be near-annihilation, near total destruction, for all involved. They know not only that what we now call *conventional* war is outmoded, but that war, itself, is now removed beyond the bounds of sanity. They know that they have only one recourse and that is—whatever their differences, they must settle them by the methods of peace. This being true, why should they not openly admit it—and openly renounce war. I believe that such a declaration by these four nations now in control of atomic energy would have constructive results that would be tremendous in scope throughout the world.

"Can't Trust Russia" Argument

In our country, when you talk about any agreement with Russia—or about any attempt to establish a living relationship between the Communist World and the Free World—you get the familiar objection: "How can we place confidence in Russia's word on anything?"

Remember what our ultimate choice is—to *live* together or to *die* together. Those who follow the "You can't trust Russia" line are casting their vote for dying together. Their arguments all boil down to continuance of hostility and suspicion . . . of the warlike posture that surely will lead eventually to *actual* war.

Now, we must realize that to a large degree the basis for this position is the thought that Communism can be eliminated from the world. The fact is that war—the rejection of peaceful coexistence as the only other alternative—would *not* eliminate Communism. Communism is an idea. In all history, ideas have *never* been changed or driven from the minds of men by force. Force has simply served to strengthen and spread ideas.

Maintain Adequate Military Defenses

The other position . . . the one I advocate . . . is simply this: Let us keep in mind the difficulty of dealing with Russia; let us not forget our past experiences, let us maintain thoroughly adequate military defenses . . . ***but***, at the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Weir Says America Need Not Fear Peaceful Competition

same time, let us make it plain to Russia and the world that our objective is peace . . . that we want to conduct international dealings and relationships by the methods of peace. There must be no war. We know it can solve no problem. Consequently, the objective must be peace.

Russia's attitude lately has been more conciliatory. She has been talking a great deal about "peaceful coexistence" not only for world consumption but also for the benefit of the Russian people. Now, there is no doubt that "peaceful coexistence" means something that is different to Russia than it is to us and other Western nations.

While in England I had a long talk on this subject with Christopher Mayhew, who is a member of Parliament and formerly was Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Under the English system, as you know, a man must be thoroughly qualified by previous training and experience to hold such a position in government. Mayhew is recognized as a particularly keen student of world affairs. He had recently returned from a trip to Russia in which one of his principal purposes was to get some understanding of just what the Russians mean by "coexistence." He had talked with a great many people from the rank and file and also such Russian leaders as Malenkov, Molotov and Gromyko.

He came to these conclusions. The Russians are devoted to the ideas of Communism. They believe that Capitalism is bound to fail, that inevitably it will be replaced by Communism throughout the world, and that it should be. In view of this, they believe they have the right and the obligation to help speed the day by giving encouragement and support to Communism everywhere. They see nothing wrong with this and are surprised that we do. They think it is entirely compatible with 'peaceful coexistence." Nevertheless, and this is highly important, Mayhew is convinced that they have come to the definite conclusion that forcible means up to and including war are an instrument of no value in promoting Communism. And, in this context, they are completely sincere in their talk about 'peaceful coexistence."

It Might Become Permanent

Mayhew pointed out that the Western nations should welcome this new Russian approach because if it is put into effect and continues for a time it stands a good chance of becoming permanent.

In other words, it is his idea—and it is the idea in Europe generally—that we should seize the opportunity to convert the present basis of cold war with its ever-present danger of *hot* war—a Hydrogen Bomb war—to the basis of peaceful competition between different ideologies and systems of government. And it is also the idea that as part of this competition, we should promote to the greatest extent possible interrelations between the Communist World and the Free World —including trade relations as one of the most important elements.

Two Forces of Enormous Power

In my mind, at least, there is not the slightest doubt as to the outcome of such a competition. I am so thoroughly convinced of the rightness of our basic principles and ideals that I believe they will prevail—not in a few years or few decades, perhaps, but certainly over the long pull. With a basis of competition from which the threat of war is removed, two forces of enormous power work on the side of enduring peace. *They are the passage of time and the operation of the universal human longing for peace, security and better conditions of life.* Certainly, these forces can work to better effect under a condition approaching normal international relations than under the present condition in which the Communist World—with one-third of the world's people—is hermetically sealed against the influence of Western thought and ideals and its way of life.

Develop a more open situation; let peace continue for awhile and it will be most difficult for the leaders of any nation to take their people into a war. Mayhew was deeply impressed with the fact that in Russia the openly expressed fear of war and the yearning for peace among people of all kinds were even more pronounced than in the West. The same thing impressed another acquaintance of mine, William R. Matthews, publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, who last year visited countries behind the Iron Curtain for the third time. He said that "peace" was the word that he heard most often wherever he went. He believed that the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia, itself, could be induced to fight only in the event of actual invasion.

Frequently, we hear it said that the people in Communist countries have no influence; that they do as they are told. Yet we know that keeping the people sold on governments and their policies is a major job of Communist leaders and one at which they work around the clock. These leaders never forget that they *came* to power as the result of revolution. They know that if they go against widespread and deeply-held desires of the people, they can also be *thrown out* of power by revolution. There is little question that peace is the No. 1 desire of people in Communist countries as it is in the rest of the world. And that is the best basis for the reasonable hope that a divided world can live together—coexist, if you will—without war.

World's Most Important Subject

Gentlemen, I fully realize that this subject of war and peace is not the most cheerful one. But it is by far the most important one before the world today. In fact, unless it is resolved in the right way, no other subject can have any genuine and permanent importance whatever. It will do us no good to pretend that this problem is not in existence. Or to lull ourselves with the belief that if we sit still and ignore it, it will somehow dry up and blow away. This problem will not solve itself. *We* must solve it. By "we" I do not mean just the President, or the State Department, or the Congress. I mean you and the State Department, or the Congress. I mean you and I and the other fellow working for a firm and clear national policy with the objective of world peace.

There can be no such national policy without widespread public recognition of its need and strong public support. Recognition and support will not develop spontaneously. They must be generated by individuals—in Cleveland and throughout the country—who have the vision to see this problem in its full meaning and the public spirit to do something about it. Such individuals as the men here tonight. And there is not one of you who cannot do something about it . . . something effective. At minimum, you can let your representatives in government know where you stand. You can initiate the discussion, the thrashing out, the coming to conclusions on this subject at everything from small home groups to large gatherings. In short—in the broad meaning of the term—you can take political action.

Do Something About It!

On many occasions in speaking to businessmen, I have stressed the importance of their taking a personal and active interest in politics—in the affairs of both political parties—because basically it is political activity, starting at the grass roots, which determines the conditions under which we must live in locality, state and nation—and ultimately determines world conditions in which we must live—or die. Very often in such talks to businessmen, I feel that it makes no impression at all . . . that it is water rolling off a duck's back. I certainly urge you strongly that this matter of a national policy for world peace is vital . . . literally a matter of life and death for all of us . . . and that each of you will leave this room tonight with the firm resolve that you personally are going to do something about it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Combine Socialism with Freedom of Discussion?

The Meaning of the Djilas-Dedijer Affair in Yugoslavia

After Tito broke away from the Cominform, Belgrade became a Mecca for Leftists of various kinds looking for a halfway house between capitalism and communism. The Yugoslavs tried very deliberately, though vaguely, to make their country a center for some kind of a new international movement, in which socialism and democracy might be combined. This movement never got very far because foreign observers, however friendly and however ready for wishful thinking, soon saw that there was little reality to all this talk. The quarrel between Belgrade and Moscow was too obviously a family quarrel—and this is how I described it in the *New York Daily Compass* after my own visit there in the Fall of 1950—between two groups of Communists, responding to the diverse national needs of their own countries.

I felt that this was another of the frequent quarrels between Russians and Serbs, and would yet end in their reconciliation, though Tito having tasted independence would never sink back into Cominform subservience. But I saw little evidence of fresh thinking on the problem of how and when one begins to move back toward freedom from a Communist dictatorship. I talked with Tito and Pijade and many other leaders. What impressed me most was, that despite their criticism of the "rigidity" and the "bureaucracy" of the Russian dictatorship, they would never get down to brass tacks on the subject. The whole subject was left vague, and the vagueness I felt was significant. To grapple concretely with the problem of what had happened in Russia would have required them to make real changes in Yugoslavia. This they were unwilling to do. The reluctance was striking when one came to discuss such a subject as the secret police and its power. When I suggested that perhaps the adoption of *habeas corpus* would be one way to put a curb on police abuses, I could never get a response, especially in talking to a top Yugoslav jurist, a real phoney and smoothie, the kind who manages to get good jobs under any regime.

"First A Human Being"

I did not speak with either Dedijer or Djilas at the time. I find their present difficulties with the regime intensely interesting. The former, in his interview with the London *Times* (Dec. 22), said two things which must strike home to everyone who believes both in socialism and in democracy. The first was in defending his fallen friend, Djilas, and explaining why he would not join in the boycott of that Titoist "deviator." Dedijer said, *"In my view a Communist should be first of all a human being, and every political movement which puts aside ethics and morals carries within it the seeds of its own destruction."* This may yet be the epitaph of the Communist movement as we have seen it under Russian auspices. The second was, "there can be no development of socialism without struggle of opinions." There never will be a system of society which can stay healthy without allowing free criticism, including criticism which may seem to be *and criticism which really is* directed at its very foundations. Healthy human societies cannot be grown in hothouses.

Amid much devotion in the giant tasks on which the Yugoslavs were engaged under Tito, there was also considerable evidence of other natural tendencies. The revolutionary who now took villas and servants for granted as his right, and began to live and act as a member of a new upper class, was often encountered. The lickspittle, the yes-man, was already making his way to the upper circles of a society still dominated by the original makers of the Yugoslav revolution. The parrots had begun to cackle, as one can hear them cackling in the resolutions of the Yugoslav and Croatian journalists' associations "unanimously" denouncing Dedijer as a traitor.

Dangerous Radical

Djilas now believes that Yugoslavia needs a two party system if free discussion is to be restored. (How radical some old ideas suddenly seem as the wheel of history turns!) He criticizes Trotzky and his followers, "Their mistake was that they wanted to be better Leninists than Stalin." He does not want to substitute one "party apparatus" for another. He thinks the evil lies in the one-party system. He thinks the name of communism has been compromised and become "a synonym for totalitarianism in this country as well as in Russia." He added, "What is the use of an ideal name? I handed in my Communist party card for moral and political reasons. Why remain in the party when I cannot say anything? Why pretend?" These are words which will strike a chord in every Communist party in the world, albeit silently. They are dangerous words because they are free words, and we wait to see how the Yugoslav regime will treat Dedijer for uttering them and Djilas for supporting him.

There is a witness Djilas may summon in his own defense, one of the great names of revolutionary socialism and one of its martyrs, Rosa Luxemburg. Early in the history of the Russian revolution, not long before she was murdered in Germany, Luxemburg wrote in friendly criticism, "Freedom for supporters of the government only, for the members of one party only—no matter how big its membership may be—is no freedom at all. Freedom is always freedom for the man who thinks differently."

Luxemburg was writing of the Bolsheviks, whose leaders were her friends. "The suppression of political life throughout the country," she wrote, "must gradually cause the vitality of the Soviets themselves to decline. Without general elections, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech, life in every public institution slows down."

"No one," Luxemburg went on (*Die Russische Revolution*, p. 113 as quoted in Paul Frölich's biography of her, London, 1940), "can escape the workings of this law. Public life gradually dies, and a few dozen party leaders with inexhaustible energy and limitless idealism direct and rule . . . In the last resort, cliquism develops a dictatorship, but not the dictatorship of the proletariat: the dictatorship of a handful of politicians, i.e., a dictatorship in the bourgeois sense, in the Jacobin sense."

This is what the Yugoslav party crisis is all about.

Don't Be Surprised When The Postman Rings Twice This Week

So many readers write in for extra copies to give friends that this week as an experiment we are mailing every subscriber an extra copy of the Weekly. We think you'll want to pass on Mr. Weir's hopeful and humane report for the New Year, and that you'll want to have others read our discussion of the Circuit Court decision most of the press, daily and weekly, ignored. These are samples of the material to be found in these pages week after week which are not available elsewhere. Help us grow by making yourself a committee of one to pass this issue onto a friend and get his subscription. As a special inducement, you may offer a sub at the gift rate of only $4 a year. If each of you get but one new reader this way I could double the circulation and reach twice as many people. Won't you help broaden the audience for the kind of message which can help give us a freer America and a more peaceful world in the New Year? Pass your extra copy on today, and get your prospect on the dotted line of the blank on the reverse side. If you want extra copies for the same purpose, I'll supply them free. And please get your own renewal in at the same time.

With all best wishes for a Happy New Year,

—I. F. STONE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Judge Who Frankly Disagrees with the First Amendment

(Continued from Page One)

It is well to remember that the same Judge Prettyman who wrote the decision upholding this first registration order is the same Judge Prettyman who made the law of the land in two similar areas, also without precedent. It was he who wrote the 2-to-1 opinion in *Barsky v. U.S.* (157 F 2d 241) in 1948 which decided for the first time that a Congressional investigating committee could inquire into political beliefs and associations even though the effect was to restrict the basic freedoms the First Amendment was supposed to safeguard against *any* abridgement by Congress. This was the decision which sent Dr. Edward K. Barsky and the members of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to jail, and it was on this precedent that the Hollywood Ten later followed them. The Supreme Court declined to review either ruling, and left the law as stated by Judge Prettyman. It was also Judge Prettyman who wrote the 2-to-1 opinion in the *Bailey* case (182 F 2d 46) in 1950 which decided that national security so takes precedence over justice to the individual that a minor government employe in a non-sensitive position may be dismissed on allegations never fully disclosed to her, or her judges. A 4-to-4 split on the Supreme Court left that the law, too.*

No First Amendment Nonsense

Judge Prettyman is no queasy legalist. He does not stoop to pretense. "We make the same assumption here," he ruled in the Communist registration case, "that we made in *Barsky v. U.S.* We assume, without deciding, that this statute will interfere with freedoms of speech and assembly . . . The problem is whether the restrictions imposed are valid in this situation." Judge Prettyman makes no strained effort to reconcile this "rule of reason" with the First Amendment. For him, "the right of free expression," as he puts it in this new decision, "ceases at the point where it leads to harm to the government."

This bold dictum takes us back to the kind of thinking against which the Framers of the Constitution rebelled. This is the language of a judge who disagrees fundamentally with the First Amendment. Judge Prettyman belongs in the English common law courts of the Eighteenth Century, when freedom of speech and press was freedom only from prior restraint, and exercised at the risk of an action for seditious libel if anything was said or printed which some official might consider "harmful" to the government.

We cannot enter at this time on a full analysis of the Judge's lengthy and ill-organized opinion. Like so many judges who have provided the rationale for repression, he jumps in simple-minded vigor from broad truisms about the right of self-preservation, national security, etc., to specific cases in a way which really abandons constitutional limitations. Of course, a government has a right to preserve itself. But does that mean it may jail a man without a warrant, hold him without a trial, punish him for views it dislikes, make him a second-class citizen because of ideas and associations the government regards as dangerous?

The Dissents, Too, Have Weakened

It is another indication of the change in the climate of opinion that the sweeping assertions of the Prettyman decision are not challenged point by point, as Judge Edgerton challenged them in his historic dissenting opinions in the *Barsky* and *Bailey* cases. Judge Bazelon, the only other liberal judge with courage on our Circuit Court bench here, confined his dissent in this case to the one issue of the Fifth amendment. But this is a slim reed to lean upon. What happens if the government orders a known Communist leader, already convicted under the Smith Act, to register under the McCarran Act and give the names (as that law requires) of all officers and members of the party? A person already "incriminated" can hardly plead the Fifth.

The issue for all who believe in a free society is a clear one. Freedom will not be preserved by defending marginal cases and mistaken identities. If it were legal to be a Communist, non-Communists would be in no danger of being forced to prove an obnoxious negative proposition. Once Communism is made illegal, every other non-conformist faces the danger of being called upon to prove that he is not a Communist. The root of the evil lies in trying to establish a system of partial liberty, of proscribing one set of ideas. This generation in America is going to have to learn by bitter lesson that liberty is indivisible.

* The same issues are now raised by the *Peters* case which we hope to discuss very soon.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name_____

Street_____

City _____ **Zone**____ **State**____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City _____ **Zone**____ **State**____

1/10/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED